UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,597	04/09/2001	John C. Tang	0007056-0031/P5063/RSH	7956

32291 7590 05/19/2006		EXAMINER
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP		STEELMAN, MARY J
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE		

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

SUITE 200
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE **3** MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 March 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *49,50 and 52-66* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *49,50 and 52-66* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to Claims, Amendments, and Remarks received 20

March 2006. Per Applicant's request, claim 51 is cancelled. Claims 49, 50, 52 -66 are amended.

Claims 49, 50, and 52-66 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2.   In view of the amendments to claims 49-59, the prior 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections are hereby

withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3.   Claims 61-66 recite "as recited in claim 53...", should be – as recited in claim 60...--.

Change 53 to 60.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant has argued, in substance, the following:

(A) As noted on page 7, 3rd paragraph, of Remarks, "Flinn is silent about GUI embodiments that

provide users with interactivity with different parts of a GUI.

Examiner's Response: Examiner disagrees. Flinn disclosed user interactivity with different

parts of a GUI. As an example (col. 9, line 48), "a mouse click (user interactivity) on one of the

co-expressed objects 44 causes an object summary 46 (a different part of a GUI) for the selected

co-expressed object 44 to be displayed."

(B) As noted on page 8, 1st paragraph, Applicant has amended claims to recite "program object",

so as to better show the program object enables interactivity to a user, different than the

functionality provided by Flinn. Flinn provides interactivity to allow relationships to be formed

between different objects.

Examiner's Response: Examiner disagrees. As an example (col. 7, line 62), "user creates new

content objects 34c or edits existing content objects 34c, as desired (block 222). Using the

display interface 14, a user may enter of edit meta-information 36 for the content object 34c..."

Flinn disclosed content objects (program object), with which the GUI interface enables user

interactivity.

(C) As noted on page 8, 2nd paragraph, amended claim 49 is further defined to include an

"accessible link to either the users or the program objects presented as an icon, the icon

providing a graphical or text indicator of the type for the accessible link...

Examiner's Response: See rejection of claim 49 below. New art has been added.

(D) As noted on page 8, 2nd paragraph, Flinn does not define relationships in a GUI that enables

accessible links to the users and program objects that are most related to the currently active

programmed object.

Examiner's Response: Examiner disagrees. As an example regarding the 'most related', see col.

11, lines 49-61. A line of varying thickness, or a color variance, may depict the degree of

relatedness.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 49, 50, and 52-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

USPN 6,795,826 B2 to Flinn et al., in view of USPN 6,014,135 to Fernandes.

Per claim 49:

A graphical display interface portal, tangibly embodied on a computer readable media, the

graphical display interface portal providing a user interface for interactivity, comprising:

Flinn: Fig. 9 and col. 9, line 13, 'display interface 14' (graphical display interface portal)

Flinn disclosed user interactivity with different parts of a GUI. As an example (col. 9, line 48),

"a mouse click (user interactivity) on one of the co-expressed objects 44 causes an object

summary 46 (a different part of a GUI) for the selected co-expressed object 44 to be displayed."

-a document display area of a user interface display screen, the document display area

defining a currently active program object that enables program interaction by a user;

Flinn: Col. 9, lines 19-20, "a first object summary 46a is presented to the display interface 14 to

represent **a selected object** 34 (active program object)." (emphasis added) See FIG. 10, #46c,

(document display area of user interface)

-a neighborhood panel presented on the user interface display screen along side with

the document display area, such that the neighborhood panel is concurrently illustrated when

the currently active program object for the user is present, the neighborhood panel including a

list of one or more users and a list of one or more program objects,

Flinn: See Fig. 9. A display interface for a selected object presents objects related (44a) to the

selected object (46a). Related objects are presented in the display area. Col. 9, lines 13-32, "The

display interface 14 may express one or more objects 34...a first object summary 46a is

presented to the display interface 14 to **represent a selected object** 34...The first object

summary 46a further provides **a list of related objects** 44a (neighborhood panel including a list

of one or more users and a list of one or more program objects). The list of related objects 44a

include one or more objects 34 that are deemed **related to the selected object** 34. The related

objects 44a are coupled together, or co-expressed...This facilitates access to the object 34

represented by the first object summary 46a, by supplying...a connection to related objects 44a."

(emphasis added) Col. 8, lines 16-35, "a client experience manager 28 tracks usage...using a

transaction log 18...Individual user access to content or topic objects 34, the number of users

accessing an object 34, and other indications of usage may be tracked...This enables users and

administrators to view the content network 40 **usage at the level of the individual topic objects**

34t and content objects 34c. The **usage patterns** may also be processed so as to **provide**

relationships among the objects in a content network 40 **based on usage, either at the level of**

individual user, or groups of users…the information supplied by the client experience manager

28 is provided by the display interface 14…" (emphasis added)

-the list of one or more users being automatically displayed in the neighborhood panel, each user

in the list of one or more users being selected for display in the neighborhood panel based on a

relationship between the user and the currently active program object, the relationship being

defined by a metric;

Flinn: Col. 8, lines 16-35 (see above) & col. 11, lines 30-35, "For example, suppose the system

100 includes a **class of content objects 34c designated 'people' (user object).** A user may

display any or all of the individual 'people content objects 34c…user may display the 'people'

content objects 34c for a selected topic object 34t." (emphasis added) Col. 13, lines 49-53, "the

system 100 may automatically establish relationships between objects 34 of the content network

40. For example, relationship indicators 42 between objects 34 may automatically be adjusted

using statistical pattern matching, neural network technology, or other techniques (relationships

defined by a metric)." Col. 9, lines 8-12, "the display interface 14 accesses data structures that

store the…content objects 34 requested…The portion of the content network 40 that is accessed

may be organized by the display interface to be visually effective (select for display based on a

relationship). Col. 9, lines 27-28, "related objects 44a are coupled together, or co-

expressed…(related objects are displayed in neighborhood panel)"

-the list of one or more program objects being automatically displayed in the neighborhood

panel, each program object in the list of one or more program objects being selected for display

in the neighborhood panel based on a relationship between the program object and the currently

active program object, the relationship being defined by a metric;

Flinn: Col. 9, lines 13-18, "display interface 14 (automatically displayed) may express one or

more objects 34...The object summaries (co-expressed in neighborhood panel) describe either

topic objects 34t or content objects 34c." (list of program objects displayed in neighborhood

panel as 'related, co-expressed objects') Col. 8, lines 8-14, "Content objects 34c are

encapsulations that contain meta-information 36c and relationships to other objects 34...content

objects 34c may include either an embedded pointer to information or the information 38c

itself...may include files, text, documents (program objects)..." Col. 13, lines 49-53, "the

system 100 may automatically establish relationships between objects 34 of the content network

40. For example, relationship indicators 42 between objects 34 may automatically be adjusted

using statistical pattern matching, neural network technology, or other techniques (relationships

defined by a metric)."

-wherein automatically displaying the list of one or more users and the list of one or more

program objects in neighborhood panel provides a viewable interrelationship and an accessible

link to the users and program objects that are most related to the currently active program object,

as defined by the metric for the users and the metric for the program objects.

Flinn: Col. 10, lines 30-34, "Relevancy control 54...control the degree to which related objects

44 are co-expressed in the ...display interface 14 (related objects, program objects and user

objects displayed) . In one embodiment, the relevancy control 54 is a GUI window, such as

depicted in FIG. 12. As an example regarding the 'most related', see col. 11, lines 49-61. A line

of varying thickness, or a color variance, may depict the degree of relatedness. Interrelationship

is shown in the display of related objects. Col. 9, lines 48-50, "a mouse click (accessible link to

the user objects and program objects) on one of the co-expresses objects 44 causes an object

summary 46 for the selected co-expressed object 44 to be displayed."

Flinn failed to specifically disclose:

-and wherein the accessible link to either the users or the program objects is presented as an icon,

the icon providing a graphical or text indicator of a type for the accessible link.

However, Fernandes disclosed a (Title) collaboration centric document processing environment

using an information centric visual user interface and information presentation method. See FIG.

3, which shows icons providing a graphical or text indicator of a type for the accessible link. As

an example, a word document type has a distinctive icon, and a user type has another distinctive

type. See related text at col. 10, line 6-47. Col. 10, line 10, "The display 50 has a plurality of

first icons 40 (A-C). Each of the first plurality of icons is a graphical representation of an

individual (accessible link to user)..." Col. 10, line 29, "The display 50 also has a plurality of

second icons 42 (A-B). Each of the plurality of second icons 42 (graphical indicator of a type for

the accessible link) is a graphical representation of information. The information can be of any type. They can include but are not limited to: spread sheet files, text files, images, sound, reference to URL sites...(program objects).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to modify Flinn, to include the teachings of Fernandes, which disclose icons providing a graphical or text indicator of a type for the accessible link, because Fernandes recognized (col. 3, line 41) the need for a VUI (visual user interface) that allows the user to "visualize the process needed to control the system to achieve his goals." Likewise, Flinn felt the need for (col. 1, line 61) "an intelligent, adaptive method of organizing and retrieving information."

Per claim 50:

-the neighborhood panel further identifies a history list, the history list defining users and program objects that the user of the currently active program object has accessed or communicated with,

Flinn: Col. 8, lines 16-22, "a client experience manager 28 tracks usage...using a transaction log (history list) 18. User interaction with the content network 40...is stored in the transaction log 18." Col. 8, lines 23-32, "Individual user access to content...objects 34, the number of users accessing an object 34, and other indications of usage may be tracked (defining users and program objects that user has accessed)...enables...to view the content network 40 usage at the

level of the individual...content objects 34c...based on usage, either at the level of individual

user, or groups of users."

-the history list being automatically updated and displayed on the user interface display screen.

Flinn: See Fig. 4. Col. 8, lines 62-67, "the user layer 10 provides the display interface 14 to

facilitate access to the content network 40 by users of the system 100...display interface 14 is a

graphical user interface (GUI) that...provides a representation of the content network 40 (content

network usage displayed on user interface display screen)." Col. 7, lines 59-60, "content objects

34c may be generated or updated automatically..."

Per claim 52:

-the currently active program object is one of a word processing document, an email message, a

telephone conversation, or a web page.

Flinn: Col. 4, lines 13-20, "files, text, documents (word processing document), articles, images,

audio (telephone conversation), video, multi-media, or signals...Where the content object 34c

supplies a pointer to information, the pointer may be a memory address...may be a Uniform

Resource Locator (web page)..."

Per claim 53:

-the metric for the users is determined by a number of times the users accessed the currently

active program object in the past.

Flinn: Col. 8, line 31, "based on usage (metric, number of times user accessed the currently

active program object)…at the level of individual user or groups of users. (number of times the

users accessed the currently active program object)"

Per claim 54:

-the metric for the program object is determined by an amount of common content between the

currently active program object and the program object.

Flinn: Col. 12, lines 29-45, Relevancy may be adjusted to indicate "most highly related objects

are co-expressed (displayed in GUI). Col. 12, lines 53-55, "relationship indicators 42 (metrics

for program object) may be established using pattern matching techniques, such as where two

objects 34 have similar information 38 (an amount of common content)…"

Per claim 55:

-the metric for the program object is determined by a frequency with which the program object is

accessed by one or more users.

Flinn: Col. 8, line 31, "based on usage (metric, number of times user accessed the currently active program object)...at the level of individual user (frequency program object is accessed by user) or groups of users."

Per claim 56:

-the metric for the program object is determined by whether the program object is a copy of the currently active program object.

Flinn: Col. 4, lines 50-65, "Each object 34 may be related to any other object 34, and may be related by a relationship and associated relationship indicator 42...by a degree manifested by the relationship indicators 42...a numerical indication of the relationship between objects 34...1 indicates a subset relationship...relationship indicators 42 are expressed using subjective descriptors that depict the 'quality' of the relationship...subjective descriptors 'high' (program object is a copy)...may indicate a relationship between two objects 34."

Regarding 'the currently active program object', Flinn disclosed (col. 9, lines 13-32), "the display interface 14...may express one or more objects 34...a first object summary is presented to the display interface to represent a selected object 34...The first object summary 46a further provides a list of related objects 44a...The related objects 44a are coupled together, or co-expressed...This facilitates access to the object..." A currently active program object and related objects are presented on a display. A metric is determined regarding the relationship of related objects.

Per claim 57:

-the metric for the program object is determined by whether the currently active program object

referenced the program object.

Flinn: Col. 13, lines 65-66, "The usage patterns (whether current active program object

referenced the program object) may thus produce 'automatic relationship adjustment' between

some objects 34 of the content network." Col. 14, lines 1-3, "if users typically always move

from object A to object B, then the relationship between A and B would be high…"

Per claim 58:

-the metric for the user is determined by whether the user has accessed the program object.

Flinn: Col. 8, lines 30-31, "relationships among the objects in a content network 40 based on

usage, either at the level of individual user (whether user has accessed the program object)…"

Per claim 59:

-the metric for the user is determined by whether the user was contacted.

Flinn: Col. 4, lines 8-9, "Content objects 34c are encapsulations that contain meta-information

36c and relationships to other objects 34." Col. 11, line 32, "people content objects 34c" Col.

13, lines 51-53, "relationship indicators 42 between objects 34 may automatically be adjusted

suing statistical pattern matching, neural network technology, or other techniques." Thus,

metrics exist for a user (people content objects) and degree of contact with other content objects.

Per claim 60:

A computer implemented method of accessing a related item through a graphical user interface

(GUI) that provides graphical access and interactivity, comprising:

Flinn: Flinn disclosed a (col. 2, line 61) 'method' for managing data. Col. 2, line 64, "objects in

the content network are related by a degree...relationships between the objects may be

established..." Flinn disclosed user interactivity with different parts of a GUI. As an example

(col. 9, line 48), "a mouse click (user interactivity) on one of the co-expressed objects 44 causes

an object summary 46 (a different part of a GUI) for the selected co-expressed object 44 to be

displayed."

-displaying a currently active program object in a display area and allowing user interaction with

aspects of the active program object;;

Flinn: Col. 8, lines 62-67, "RIG. 4, the user layer 10 provides the display interface 14 to

facilitate access to the content network 40...the display interface 14 is a graphical user interface

(GUI)..." Col. 9, lines 19-20, "a first object summary 46a is presented to the display interface

(display area) 14 to represent a selected object 34 (currently active program object)..."

-automatically generating a list of related users and program objects for the currently active

program object based on a metric;

Flinn: Col. 9, lines 23-32, "The first object summary 46a further provides a list of related objects

44a (automatically generating a list of related users (people content objects) and program

objects). The list of related objects 44a includes one or more objects 34 that are deemed related

(based n a metric – see rejections related to metrics above) to the selected object 34 (currently

active program object). The related objects 44a are coupled together, or co-expressed..."

-concurrently displaying the list of related users and program objects in a neighborhood panel,

such that the neighborhood panel is displayed along with the currently active program object in

the display area;

Flinn: As an example, see FIG. 10. Related users and program objects (44c) in a neighborhood

panel (46c) are displayed along with the currently active program object (48c).

-enabling access to at least one of the related users or program objects through the neighborhood

panel

Flinn: Col. 9, lines 48-50, "a mouse click (enabling access) on one of the co-expressed objects

44 (related users or program objects) causes an object summary 46 for the selected co-expressed

object 44 to be displayed." Related objects are linked on the GUI.

Flinn failed to explicitly disclose:

-wherein access to either the users or the program objects is enabled through an icon, the icon

providing a graphical or text indicator of a type for the access.

However, Fernandes disclosed a (Title) collaboration centric document processing environment

using an information centric visual user interface and information presentation method. See FIG.

3, which shows icons providing a graphical or text indicator of a type for the accessible link. As

an example, a word document type has a distinctive icon, and a user type has another distinctive

type. See related text at col. 10, line 6-47. Col. 10, line 10, "The display 50 has a plurality of

first icons 40 (A-C). Each of the first plurality of icons is a graphical representation of an

individual (accessible link to user)..." Col. 10, line 29, "The display 50 also has a plurality of

second icons 42 (A-B). Each of the plurality of second icons 42 (graphical indicator of a type for

the accessible link) is a graphical representation of information. The information can be of any

type. They can include but are not limited to: spread sheet files, text files, images, sound,

reference to URL sites...(program objects).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the

invention, to modify Flinn, to include the teachings of Fernandes, which disclose icons providing

a graphical or text indicator of a type for the accessible link, because Fernandes recognized (col.

3, line 41) the need for a VUI (visual user interface) that allows the user to "visualize the process

needed to control the system to achieve his goals." Likewise, Flinn felt the need for (col. 1, line

61) "an intelligent, adaptive method of organizing and retrieving information."

Per claim 61:

-the neighborhood panel further identifies a history list, the history list defining users and

program objects that the user of the currently active program object has accessed or

communicated with,

-the history list being automatically updated and displayed in the display area.

See rejection of limitations addressed in claim 50 above.

Per claim 62:

-the currently active program object is one of a word processing document, an email message, a

telephone conversation, or a web page.

See rejection of limitations addressed in claim 52 above.

Per claim 63:

-selecting one or more users for display in the neighborhood panel based on a

relationship, between the user and the currently active program object, defined by the metric.

See rejection of limitations addressed in claim 49 above.

Per claim 64:

-determining the metric for the users by the number of times the users accessed the currently

active program object in the past.

See rejection of limitations addressed in claim 53 above.

Per claim 65:

-determining the metric for the program object by a frequency with which the program object is

accessed by one or more users.

See rejection of limitations addressed in claim 55 above.

Per claim 66:

-determining the metric for the program object by an amount of common content between

the currently active program object and the program object.

See rejection of limitations addressed in claim 54 above.

Conclusion

7.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Mary Steelman, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3704. The examiner

can normally be reached Monday through Thursday, from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM If attempts to

reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be

reached at (571) 272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or

proceeding is assigned: 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be

directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mary Steelman

05/08/2006